
**DCSS P3 PROJECT
NON-JUDICIAL FORMS WORKGROUP
AUGUST 8, 2000 MEETING
MEETING SUMMARY**

A. GENERAL

On Tuesday, August 8, 2000, the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) Policies, Procedures, and Practices (P3) Project, Non-Judicial Forms Workgroup, held its second official session in Sacramento. The following members attended:

- ☒ Bill Kirk, State Co-Leader (DCSS Data Manager)
- ☒ Pat Ratty, County Co-Leader & Small County Rep (Paralegal---Placer)
- ☒ Pamela Crandall, County Analyst (FSO Supervisor---Sonoma)
- ☒ Rita Carroll, State Analyst (DCSS System Standards Analyst)
- ☒ Kristy Johnson, State Analyst (DCSS System Standards Analyst)
- ☒ Ruth Franklin, Medium County Rep (FSO Supervisor---Santa Clara)
- ☒ Deborah Potter, Large County Rep (Analyst---Fresno)
- ☒ Robert McLeod, Advocate Rep (ACES---Legal Research)
- ☒ Jenny Skoble, Advocate Rep (Harriett Buhai Ctr---Staff Attorney)
- ☐ Ed Kent, FTB Rep (CCSAS Child Support Specialist)
- ☒ Lynn Johnson, FTB Rep (CCSAS Info Systems Analyst)
- ☐ Judi Bentzien, FTB Rep (CCSAS Child Support Specialist)
- ☒ Kathleen Cullen, Judicial Council (County Clerk---Orange)
- ☒ Kristen Hoadley, Judicial Council (San Francisco)

Attending *ex officio* were:

- ☒ Julie Hopkins, Facilitator (SRA International)
- ☐ Pat Pianko, Resource (OCSE Rep---Region 9)
- ☐ John Schambre, Resource (OCSE Rep---Region 9)
- ☐ Nancy Bienia, Resource (OCSE Rep---DC)

This meeting summary highlights points covered, material discussed, and decisions made, and follow-up tasks for forthcoming sessions. Comments and corrections should be addressed to Julie Hopkins at julie.hopkins@dss.ca.gov.

Kathleen Cullen introduced herself and gave us her background. She is here to help us with any legal issues we may have. Family Law Facilitator

Kristen Hoadley introduced herself and gave us her background. Works with the DA's office closely. Contribution: to help translate the needs of the clients and to make the forms more effective.

B. REVIEW OF LAST MEETING'S MINUTES

Julie Hopkins opened the discussion with a review of what the group had accomplished in its last session, and the goal for today's session: to identify our customers and the types of client communication forms that should be standardized.

C. TODAY'S TENTATIVE AGENDA

Issue One: Identify the customers and the types of client communication forms that should be standardized.

Workplan: Develop a list of the customers
 Develop a list of forms categories, including legally required forms

The group will continue work on Issue One into the third session.

D. UNRESOLVED AND/OR OPEN ISSUES REMAINING FROM ISSUE TWO

Jenny was asked to provide her review of the legal requirements related to forms. Jenny felt that now may not be the time to worry about legal requirements. The guidelines are not very specific at this time, though they may need to be addressed at a later date. After some discussion, it was agreed that Jenny would reduce her opinion to writing. This is an action item for Jenny for the next meeting on the legal requirements from the various codes: California FC, CFR and US Code.

Robert was then asked to report on the ACES Best Practices guide. He had not had an opportunity to review it since the last meeting. It was agreed that he would review and report out at the next meeting. The guide provides recommendations for an effective child support system; Robert will review and report out on any information related to non-judicial forms.

There was general discussion as to how the group should proceed from this point. Some felt that our focus should be narrowed to examine specific forms, while others felt that we should work to provide a broad framework that could be used as a starting point to examine all forms in detail. This detailed work would be accomplished after the P3 Project ended, either by this group or another (see **Recommendations**). After much discussion, the group agreed to proceed per the workplan, and then prioritize the forms categories to focus on those deemed most important.

E. FORMS CUSTOMERS

Lynn prepared and distributed a master list of IV-D customers. The group reviewed and discussed the list. It was suggested, and agreed, that the Family Law Facilitators be added to the Courts customer category. There was also some discussion of "customer ownership", i.e., whether DCSS or the local child support agency is ultimately accountable to the customer. It was agreed that, under the new organization, both DCSS and the local child support agency would have ultimate accountability to the customers.

F. FORMS CATEGORIES

There was a great deal of discussion in this area. There were many options for categorizing forms, including by processing function, or by customer categories. Upon review of the customer listing, it was decided that we would use the customer listing to categorize forms.

We identified five categories of customers to which forms are directed:

- **Case members/Other Parties**
 - CP/NCP; IV-A/IV-E; Attorneys; PO's; relatives
- **Resource Agencies**
 - OCSE; IRS; Post Office; SSA; Bankruptcy Court; Genetic Testing Labs
- **Involved Agencies**
 - Attorney General; State Bar; SLMS Licensing Agencies; FSD Offices; DOJ; CPLS; FTB; CCR; CDC
- **DCSS**
- **Employers**

We attempted to identify specific customers for each category, but could not as customers could be listed in multiple categories.

G. MOST COMMON FORMS BY CATEGORY

We then moved on to develop a list of most common forms by category. Although this task was designated for our next work session, we decided to work on it rather than focus on county conversion issues (as per our agenda). County conversion issues may be addressed at the next session.

Pam prepared and distributed a comprehensive list of common forms for various customers. Using this and the SACSS forms listing, the group began to brainstorm forms that would be standard for each of the five customer categories outlined above.

Case Members/Other Parties

CP

- Application package
 - One with an order
 - One with no order
 - Include updated information packet (legally required)
- Case opened
- Request for additional information
- Confirmation of receipt of information as well as follow-up
- Quarterly locate letter (Annual)
- Affidavit of support payments including periods of cohabitation/visitation/aid paid
- Non-disclosure Notice Re: Domestic Violence

- Child support enforcement program notice (informational)
- CP questionnaire/supplemental questionnaire
- Child care verification
- Visitation verification
- Appointment letter
- Notice of action taken
- Notice of insurance
- Continuing service (MNO) notice
- Review/Modification notices
- Referral to Facilitator's Office (and a notice to the Facilitator that a referral has been made)
- Monthly Statements
- Payment history (major overhaul)
- Complaint resolution forms (county level)
- Fair hearing forms (state level)
- Case closure letter

NCP

- Application package
 - One with an order
 - One with no order
 - Include updated information packet (legally required)
- Case opened
- Non-disclosure Notice Re: Domestic Violence
- Child support enforcement program notice (informational)
- Summons and Complaint cover letters
- Initial contact letters
- Paternity declarations/other
- Case closure letter
- SLMS response letter
- Appointment letter
- Review and adjustment letters
- Direct payments to CP
- Report new employer letter
- Referral to facilitators office
- 10 day notice of Credit report
- Notice of Insurance
- Arrearage/notice dispute letter

The group agreed to continue this categorization at the next meeting. All members of the group will review the SACSS forms listing, to categorize them in one of the five groups identified above. They may also identify county-specific forms that the group may want to consider for inclusion in the list.

H. RECOMMENDATIONS

During our meeting, the group identified the following items, for inclusion in our final recommendations:

- That there be a group to develop and manage a process/procedure for reviewing/revising forms. Membership should be similar to the makeup of this group.
- That there be an approval process for non-standard forms. All counties must comply with this process prior to implementing use of non-standard forms.
- Informational letter must be sent with summons and complaint.
- There should be representatives of all interested groups on the review committee, to include membership from other agencies such as EDD or DMV.
- That this group should continue beyond 12/2000.
- Develop list of forms that need immediate attention (after forms are categorized).
- That there must be clear, concise direction from DCSS when new forms come out. The appropriate use of the form must be clear, and all staff must receive training on the form. Connect goal of form with end-users of form.

I. CROSS-WORKGROUP ISSUES *[To be submitted to the Scribe for inclusion in the minutes by Lynn Johnson, assigned to track these issues]*

The following issues were identified in minutes from other workgroups:

- Client Access: make communications better; try to prevent the need for inquiries
- Client Access: provide education on how to fill out forms (both for staff and customers)
- Fair Hearings: develop forms necessary for the Fair Hearings/County Complaint resolution process

In our session, we identified the following issues for other workgroups:

- Case Management: there is a need for common case numbering process/protocol among child support cases and court cases
- Training: staff need training for new JCF forms and NJC forms. Ongoing forms training for staff, making the goal/purpose of the form clear to staff
- Client Access: clients need to be educated on how to complete forms, including an explanation of why they are providing information and why it is important
- Client Access: clear letters of explanation must be sent with the summons and complaint
- Case Management/Case Processing: possible policy/best practices re giving NCP the opportunity to dispute account balance at case opening

J. SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS *[To be submitted to the Scribe for inclusion in the minutes by Lynn Johnson, assigned to track these issues]*

The following requirements were identified in minutes from other workgroups:

- Client Access: direct deposit for CPs and other agencies
- Client Access: prioritization of cases, i.e., those most likely to pay
- Caseworker Staffing: statewide system should employ document imaging
- Fair Hearings: generate forms necessary to support the Fair Hearings/County Complaint resolution process
- Fair Hearings: system shall track and monitor timeframes on all Fair Hearings/County complaint resolution actions

In our session, we identified the following requirements:

- Interface with enforcement agencies (FTB, DMV LICENSING BOARD) when action taken by agency-notice is given to CCSAS
- Build in logic to filter incoming information and suppress/delete other actions when appropriate
- Non-camp enforcement policy re priorities for enforcement actions and multiple actions (Note: If policy made, this would result in system requirements to support priority of enforcement action and overkill)

K. HANDOUTS

- IV-D Customers List
- Code on the Important Notice
- Sonoma County Type of Non Judicial Form/Letter List
- Placer County Time frames Matrix
- JetForms Filler Menu/Placer County
- Barnes Notice
- Copy Administrative Order for Genetic (Parentage) Testing
- KIDZ Forms and Counties (e-mail)
- Fresno County Forms (e-mail)

L. ACTION ITEMS/HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS FOR NEXT SESSION

- See attached listing
- Agenda and Workplan for Session Three will be sent as soon as possible, pending discussion with group leaders

J. ANCILLARY (PARKING LOT) ISSUES

K. ATTACHMENTS

- Action Item List